

# UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED I	NVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/215,095	12/18/98	BECKER		N	GC507-2
-		1940/0406	一		EXAMINER
HM12/0106 KIRSTEN A ANDERSON				BORIN	, M
GENENCOR I		AL INC		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
925 PAGE M PALO ALTO	ILL ROAD			1631 DATE MAILED:	01/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

Application No. 09/215,095

Becker et al

Office Action Summary Examiner

M. Borin

Group Art Unit 1631



rs, prosecution as to the merits is closed 3 O.G. 213.  3month(s), or thirty days, whichever thin the period for response will cause the ay be obtained under the provisions of is/are pending in the application. is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to.  sject to restriction or election requirement.
month(s), or thirty days, whichever thin the period for response will cause the ay be obtained under the provisions of  is/are pending in the application.  is/are withdrawn from consideration.  is/are allowed.  is/are rejected.  is/are objected to.  sject to restriction or election requirement.
month(s), or thirty days, whichever thin the period for response will cause the ay be obtained under the provisions of  is/are pending in the application.  is/are withdrawn from consideration.  is/are allowed.  is/are rejected.  is/are objected to.  sject to restriction or election requirement.
is/are withdrawn from consideration. is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. sject to restriction or election requirement.
is/are withdrawn from consideration. is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. sject to restriction or election requirement.
is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. sject to restriction or election requirement. O-948. Examiner.
is/are rejected.  is/are objected to.  sject to restriction or election requirement.  O-948.  Examiner.
is/are rejected.  is/are objected to.  sject to restriction or election requirement.  O-948.  Examiner.
is/are objected to.  sject to restriction or election requirement.  O-948.  Examiner.
O-948.
O-948. Examiner.
Bapproved disapproved.  S.C. § 119(a)-(d).  documents have been  Il Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  U.S.C. § 119(e).
_ <del>_</del>
•

Page 2 Serial Number: 09/215095

Art Unit: 1631

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Status of the claims

Claims 1-65 are pending. 1.

Response to restriction requirement filed 05/13/99 is acknowledged. Applicant elected, without traverse, Group II, claims 1,2,6-11 (all in part), claims 3,5, claims 23, 24, 28-33 (all in part), claim 25,27, drawn to granules combining a protein, a disaccharide, and a polysaccharide. Newly submitted claims 57-65 are also included into the elected Group. Claims 4,12-22,26,34-56 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected groups. Cancellation of claims 4,12-22,26,34-56, and amendment of claims 1,2,6-11, 23, 24, 28-33 to read on elected invention are requested.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C.102 that form the 2. basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States...

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having Serial Number: 09/215095

Art Unit: 1631

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-3,5-11,23-25,27-33, 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kiesser et al. (US Patent 5,739,091)

### Kiesser

Kiesser et al. teach enzymer granules. The granules comprise enzyme or enzyme mixture, sugars, such as glucose, and a filler, such as cellulose. See column 1, lines 31-39, 60-67, column 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 4. The granules may further comprise binders, such as polyethyleneglycol. See col. 2, lines 16-24. The granules may be covered with a protective coating (col.4, lines 5-11). The coating can contain sugars (col. 4, lines 8-10) or polyethyleneglycol (col.4, line 46). The granules may be prepared by layering the enzyme around dry pre-mix. See col. 4, lines 21-24.

It is the Examiners position that all the elements of Applicant's invention with respect to the specified claims are instantly disclosed by the teaching of the reference cited above.

Serial Number: 09/215095

Art Unit: 1631

4. Claims 1-3, 5,6, 23-25,27,28, 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Scott (EP 272923).

### Scott

Scott teaches granules including enzyme(glucose oxidase), sugar (glucose), low molecular weight polysaccharide (e.g., cellulose), and optionally synthetic polymer (e.g., polyethylene glycol). See abstract, p.5, lines 7-13,; p. 2, lines 43-54.

It is the Examiners position that all the elements of Applicant's invention with respect to the specified claims are instantly disclosed by the teaching of the reference cited above.

Scott et al. The reference is used as applied to claims 1-3, 5,6, 23-25,27,28, 57-65 in the preceeding paragraph. The reference does not teach forming a granule over a seed particle and the presence of a coating layer over the granule. If there are any differences between Applicant's claimed methods and that of the prior art, the differences would be appear minor in nature. Although Scott does not not teach protein core layered over a seed particle and coating the particle, it would be conventional and within the skill of the art to prepare such granule because the techniques of using a seed particle for the intended purpose of forming a granule and coating the granule to protect its content are well known in the pharmaceutical art, and are within the skill in the art to which this invention pertains.

. .

Serial Number: 09/215095 Page 5

Art Unit: 1631

6. Claims 1-3, 5,6-11,23-25,27-33, 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as obvious over

Martussen (EP 304332).

Martussen

Martussen teaches enzyme granules comprising an enzyme core surrounded by a coating

comprising cellulose or artificial binders. The granule further comprises a binder, such as polyvinyl

pirrolidone, cellulose derivatives, etc., and a granulating agent, such as polyglycols. See abstract,

pages 2-3. The referenced granule does not contain sugar and polysaccharide. However, addition

of such ingredients would be prima facie obvious when the enzyme granulates are to be used as

nutrient additives, because the reference teaches that in such cases the core could contain sugar, or

starch, or protein. See p. 2, lines 32-34.

Further, in regard to claims 7,9,29,31, if there are any differences between Applicant's claimed

methods and that of the prior art, the differences would be appear minor in nature. Although the

prior art does not not teach protein core layered over a seed particle, it would be conventional and

within the skill of the art to prepare such granule because the techniques of using a seed particle for

the intended purpose of forming a granule is well known in the pharmaceutical art, and are within the

skill in the art to which this invention pertains.

Prior art made of record

Page 6

Serial Number: 09/215095

Art Unit: 1631

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure: EP 501375, EP 336231, US 5,814,501, WO 97/23606.

### Conclusion.

8. No claims are allowed.

9. The Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid any papers for this

application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1631.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (703) 305-4506. Dr. Borin can

normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday. If

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael

Woodward, can be reached on (703) 308-4028. The fax telephone number for this group is (703)

305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should be directed to

the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

December 23, 1999

mlb

CAICHAEL BORING PATENT EXAMINE